

Generalized GHZ-class and W-class concurrence and entanglement vectors of the multipartite systems consisting of qubits

An Min WANG^{1,2*}

¹ *Laboratory of Quantum Communication and Quantum Computing and Institute for Theoretical Physics and*

² *Department of Modern Physics, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei 230026, People's Republic of China*

We propose two classes of the generalized concurrence vectors of the multipartite systems consisting of qubits. Making use of them, we are able to, respectively, describe and quantify GHZ-class and W-class entanglement both in total and between arbitrary two partite in the multipartite system consisting of qubits. In the case of pure state of three qubits that one partite is separable, it is shown to exactly back to the usual Wootters' concurrence after introduce a whole concurrence vector. In principle, our method is applicable to any N -partite systems consisting of N qubits.

PACS numbers: 03.67.-a, 03.65.Bz, 03.65.Ud

Quantum entanglement lies at the heart of quantum mechanics and is viewed as a useful resource in quantum information. At present, there are three most promising ideas for quantifying entanglement. They are the entanglement of formation [1, 2], the relative entropy of entanglement [3] and the entanglement of distillation [1, 4] for bipartite systems. In particular, *via* Wootters' development [5], the entanglement of formation is written as a binary entropy function of the density matrix or concurrence for a pair of qubits.

Since Bennett *et al.*'s work [6], the measures of entanglement in multipartite systems have attracted a lot of attention and achieved some developments. One of them is that a kind of form of concurrence of three qubits was suggested [7].

Recent years, based on the above ideas of the entanglement measures, we have tried to put forward to the generalized entanglement of formation (GEF)[8] and modified relative entropy of entanglement (MRE) in multipartite systems [9]. Moreover, we also study the obvious expression of concurrence [10] and the general solution of a 4×4 Hermit and positive matrix [11] in order to seek for a general expression of concurrence of multipartite systems consisting of qubits. However, it is still difficult to find out such a form of concurrence of many qubits since involving amount of calculations.

Usually, for simplicity, the entanglement of multipartite systems is thought of a single scalar. However, because that three qubits can be entangled in two inequivalent ways and one class state of them can not be obtained from another class state *via* any local operation and classical communication (LOCC)[12], we can think that the entanglement measure contains or divides two parts: GHZ-class and W-class ones. In addition, the entanglement between arbitrary two partite also need be

known in practise. Thus, in our view, it is better to use the vectorial and class-related measures to quantify the entanglement of multipartite systems. Therefore, in this letter, we propose two classes of generalized concurrence vectors of the multipartite systems consisting of qubits, which are functions of the density of matrix. Making use of them, we are able to, respectively, describe and qualify GHZ-class and W-class entanglement both in total and between arbitrary two partite in the multipartite systems consisting of qubits. In the case of pure state of three qubits that one partite is separable, it is shown to exactly back to the usual Wootters' concurrence after introduce a whole concurrence vector. In principle, our method is applicable to any N -partite system consisting of N qubits.

Let us start with the concurrence of two qubits [2, 5]. In terms of so-called magic basis, one can rewrite the entanglement of formation for a pure state $|\psi\rangle = a|00\rangle + b|01\rangle + c|10\rangle + d|11\rangle$ as a binary entropy function

$$H(x) = -x \log x - (1-x) \log(1-x), \quad (1a)$$

$$x = \frac{1 + \sqrt{1 - C^2}}{2} \quad (1b)$$

where C is called as "concurrence", and

$$C = 2|ad - bc| \quad (2)$$

The idea of Wootters' work [5] is just to take such a binary entropy function as a measure of entanglement for mixed state and obtain a method to calculate correct concurrence so that this binary entropy function dependent on C is not larger than $\sum_i p^i E_{EF}(\rho_i^P)$ for any pure state decompositions $\rho^M = \sum_i p^i \rho_i^P$. Wootters gave out, for the mixed state ρ of two qubits, the concurrence is

$$C = \max(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_3 - \lambda_4, 0) \quad (3)$$

where the λ_i , in decreasing order, are the square roots of the eigenvalues of the generation matrix $\rho^{1/2} \tilde{\rho} \rho^{1/2} = \rho^{1/2} (\sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_2) \rho^* (\sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_2) \rho^{1/2}$, and ρ^* denotes the complex conjugation of ρ in the computation basis $\{|00\rangle, |01\rangle, |10\rangle, |11\rangle\}$. Alternatively, one can say that the λ_i are the square roots of the eigenvalues of $\rho \tilde{\rho}$.

*It is founded by the National Fundamental Research Program of China with No. 2001CB309310, partially supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No. 60173047 and the Natural Science Foundation of Anhui Province.

Wootters' formula of concurrence makes use of what can be called "spin flip" transformation. For a general state described by a density matrix ρ in the systems of two qubits, this spin-flipped state is defined by

$$\tilde{\rho}_{A_1 A_2} = (\sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_2) \rho_{A_1 A_2}^* (\sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_2) \quad (4)$$

One has known that this way can not be directly extended to the multipartite systems because the trace of $\rho \tilde{\rho}$ is zero for a pure state of three qubits.

In order to overcome this difficulty, we note that $\sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_2$ can be written as a linear combination of Bell's states with the weight ± 1 , that is

$$\sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_2 = \sum_{i=1}^4 c_i |B_i\rangle \langle B_i| \quad (5)$$

where $c_1 = c_4 = -1$, $c_2 = c_3 = 1$, and four Bell's states $|B_i\rangle$ are denoted by, respectively, $|B_1\rangle = (|00\rangle + |11\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$, $|B_2\rangle = (|00\rangle - |11\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$, $|B_3\rangle = (|01\rangle + |10\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$, $|B_4\rangle = (|01\rangle - |10\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$. Therefore, we can rewrite the "spin flipped" (tilde) density matrix as

$$\tilde{\rho}_{A_1 A_2} = \sum_{i,j=1}^4 c_i c_j \langle B_j | \rho_{A_1 A_2} | B_i \rangle |B_i\rangle \langle B_j| \quad (6)$$

It implies that the generation matrix of concurrence $\rho^{1/2} \tilde{\rho} \rho^{1/2}$ has the following the important physical features: (1) Its matrix elements are the linear combinations of the matrix elements of density matrix on cat state basis with the weight ± 1 ; (2) It is just a cat state when the ρ is a cat state; (3) It is a zero matrix when the ρ is a (fully) separable pure state.

Our physical idea (or assumption) is the above three features are kept in the case of multipartite systems consisting of qubits. However, from the above statement, such a concurrence must be a class of concurrence that only can quantify GHZ-class entanglement of the entangled states, which can be seen more clearly later.

In order to obtain the concurrence of multipartite of systems, let's first denote the GHZ's states for N -qubits

$$|g_i^N\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(|s_{[(i+1)/2]}^N\rangle + (-1)^{i-1} |s_{2^N-1+[(i+1)/2]}^N\rangle \right) \quad (7)$$

where $[\]$ means to take the integer part and all of $|s_i^N\rangle$ are the familiar spin basis (computation basis).

Consider the case of three qubits, its "tilde" state should be written as

$$\tilde{\rho}_{A_1 A_2 A_3}^{\text{ghz}} = \sum_{i,j=1}^8 c_i c_j \langle g_j^3 | \rho_{A_1 A_2 A_3} | g_i^3 \rangle |g_i^3\rangle \langle g_j^3| \quad (8)$$

In particular, for a pure state $\rho = |\psi\rangle \langle \psi|$, we have

$$\tilde{\rho}_{A_1 A_2 A_3}^{\text{ghz}} = |\Psi\rangle \langle \Psi|, \quad |\Psi\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^8 c_i |\psi | g_i^3 \rangle |g_i^3\rangle \quad (9)$$

Under the requirement keeping the invariance of GHZ's states, we have $c_i^2 = 1$, that is, c_i is equal to 1 or -1 . Set $\rho = |000\rangle \langle 000|$, from $\tilde{\rho} \rho = 0$ it follows that $c_1 = -c_2$. This is because that $|\Psi\rangle$ becomes $(c_1 |g_1^3\rangle + c_2 |g_2^3\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ and $\langle \Psi | 000 \rangle = 0$ result in $c_1 + c_2 = 0$. Likewise, we obtain

$$c_{2i-1} = -c_{2i} \quad (i = 1, 2, 3, 4) \quad (10)$$

Furthermore, when ρ is a fully separable pure state, without loss of generality, we write it by

$$|\psi_s\rangle = (a_1 |0\rangle + b_1 |1\rangle) \otimes (a_2 |0\rangle + b_2 |1\rangle) \otimes (a_3 |0\rangle + b_3 |1\rangle) \quad (11)$$

Thus, from Eq.(9) it follows that

$$\langle \Psi | \psi_s \rangle = 2(c_1 + c_3 + c_5 + c_7) a_1 a_2 a_3 b_1 b_2 b_3 \quad (12)$$

Based on our precondition, for any fully separable pure state, $\langle \Psi | \psi_s \rangle = 0$, it follows that,

$$c_1 + c_3 + c_5 + c_7 = 0 \quad (13)$$

It corresponds to three choices: (1) $c_1 = c_3 = -1$, $c_5 = c_7 = 1$; (2) $c_1 = c_5 = -1$, $c_3 = c_7 = 1$; (3) $c_1 = c_7 = -1$, $c_3 = c_5 = 1$. The others are given by eq.(10).

It must be emphasized that $\tilde{\rho}$ has to be get by a local transformation from ρ . Otherwise, it can change the quantity of entanglement of the studied state in general.

Actually, we have found out three local transformations which are the direct products of Pauli matrices

$$\tilde{\rho}^{\text{ghz}}(1, 2) = (\sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_1) \rho^* (\sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_1) \quad (14a)$$

$$\tilde{\rho}^{\text{ghz}}(1, 3) = (\sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_2) \rho^* (\sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_2) \quad (14b)$$

$$\tilde{\rho}^{\text{ghz}}(2, 3) = (\sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_2) \rho^* (\sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_2) \quad (14c)$$

Because these product of Pauli matrices have forms

$$\sum_{k=1}^8 c_k(i, j) |g_k^3\rangle \langle g_k^3| \quad (i < j, i, j = 1, 2, 3) \quad (15)$$

and their coefficients $c_k(1, 2)$, $c_k(1, 3)$ and $c_k(2, 3)$ respectively correspond to the three choices (1), (2) and (3).

Therefore, we can define the generation matrices of GHZ-class concurrences by

$$M_C^{\text{ghz}}(i, j) = \rho^{1/2} \tilde{\rho}^{\text{ghz}}(i, j) \rho^{1/2} \quad (16)$$

First, consider a pure state $\rho = |\psi\rangle \langle \psi|$. Because $\rho^2 = \rho$, then $\rho^{1/2} = \rho$. The generation matrix of concurrence becomes $M_C = |\langle \Psi | \psi \rangle|^2 \rho$. It means that *for a pure state $|\psi\rangle$, its three GHZ-class concurrences are given by*

$$C_{ij}^{\text{ghz}} = |\langle \Psi_{ij} | \psi \rangle|, \quad |\Psi_{ij}\rangle = \sum_{k=1}^8 c_k(i, j) |\psi | g_k^3 \rangle |g_k^3\rangle \quad (17)$$

For the case of mixed states, we suggest according to Wootters's form, without a strict proof, in multipartite systems, and then defining the concurrences

$$C_{ij}^{\text{ghz}} = \max \left(2\lambda_1^{\text{ghz}}(i, j) - \sum_{k=1}^8 \lambda_k^{\text{ghz}}(i, j), 0 \right) \quad (18)$$

where the $\lambda_k^{\text{ghz}}(i, j)$ ($i < j$, $i, j = 1, 2, 3$), in decreasing order, are the square roots of the eigenvalues corresponding to the generation matrices $M_C^{\text{ghz}}(1, 2)$, $M_C^{\text{ghz}}(1, 3)$ and $M_C^{\text{ghz}}(2, 3)$.

We think that the above three concurrences form a so-called GHZ-class “concurrence vector” of the entangled states. Making use of C_{ij}^{ghz} , ($i < j$, $i, j = 1, 2, 3$), we can rightly describe and qualify GHZ-class entanglement of the entangled states between the partite i and the partite j *via*. defining a GHZ-class measure vector of entanglement, whose components are

$$E_{ij}^{\text{ghz}} = H \left[\frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \sqrt{1 - C_{ij}^{\text{ghz}2}} \right) \right] \quad (19)$$

where $H(x)$ is a binary entropy function as Eq.(1a). The total GHZ-class entanglement measure, as a scalar, can be defined as the norm of this entanglement vector

$$E_T^{\text{ghz}} = \sqrt{E_{12}^{\text{ghz}2} + E_{13}^{\text{ghz}2} + E_{23}^{\text{ghz}2}} \quad (20)$$

Without loss of generality, we denote a pure state by

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^8 x_i |s_i^3\rangle \quad (21)$$

It is easy to obtain that

$$C_{12}^{\text{ghz}} = 2|x_4x_5 + x_3x_6 - x_2x_7 - x_1x_8| \quad (22a)$$

$$C_{13}^{\text{ghz}} = 2|x_4x_5 - x_3x_6 + x_2x_7 - x_1x_8| \quad (22b)$$

$$C_{23}^{\text{ghz}} = 2|x_4x_5 - x_3x_6 - x_2x_7 + x_1x_8| \quad (22c)$$

Obviously, for the fully separable pure states, they are zero. For the general GHZ's states including the non maximum ones (for example, $\alpha|000\rangle + \beta|111\rangle$), their components of concurrence vector are all equal to $2|\alpha\beta|$. However, for a general W-state or a general anti W-state:

$$|W\rangle = \alpha|001\rangle + \beta|010\rangle + \gamma|100\rangle \quad (23)$$

$$|\overline{W}\rangle = \alpha|011\rangle + \beta|101\rangle + \gamma|110\rangle \quad (24)$$

their above components of concurrence vector are equal to zero. It implies that the above concurrence vector can not qualify the entanglement of W-class states rightly. It is not surprised since our above definition in Eq.(8).

In terms of similar physical idea and calculation method, we are able to define the W-class concurrence vector. First, we write down

$$\hat{\rho}^W(1, 2) = (\sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_0) \rho^* (\sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_0) \quad (25a)$$

$$\hat{\rho}^W(1, 3) = (\sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_0 \otimes \sigma_2) \rho^* (\sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_0 \otimes \sigma_2) \quad (25b)$$

$$\hat{\rho}^W(2, 3) = (\sigma_0 \otimes \sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_2) \rho^* (\sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_2) \quad (25c)$$

where we have used the fact that these local transformations have the forms

$$\sum_{k=1}^8 d_k(i, j) |B_k(i, j)\rangle \langle B_k(i, j)| \quad (26)$$

where $|B_k(i, j)\rangle$ ($i < j$, $i, j = 1, 2, 3$) are that Bell's states of (i, j) -partite product a spin basis of the third sparable partite, for example,

$$|B_1(1, 2)\rangle = (|s_1^3\rangle + |s_7^3\rangle)/\sqrt{2} \quad (27a)$$

$$|B_2(1, 2)\rangle = (|s_1^3\rangle - |s_7^3\rangle)/\sqrt{2} \quad (27b)$$

$$|B_3(1, 2)\rangle = (|s_3^3\rangle + |s_5^3\rangle)/\sqrt{2} \quad (27c)$$

$$|B_4(1, 2)\rangle = (|s_3^3\rangle - |s_5^3\rangle)/\sqrt{2} \quad (27d)$$

$$|B_5(1, 2)\rangle = (|s_2^3\rangle + |s_8^3\rangle)/\sqrt{2} \quad (27e)$$

$$|B_6(1, 2)\rangle = (|s_2^3\rangle - |s_8^3\rangle)/\sqrt{2} \quad (27f)$$

$$|B_7(1, 2)\rangle = (|s_4^3\rangle + |s_6^3\rangle)/\sqrt{2} \quad (27g)$$

$$|B_8(1, 2)\rangle = (|s_4^3\rangle - |s_6^3\rangle)/\sqrt{2} \quad (27h)$$

and the weights are

$$d_1(i, j) = -d_3(i, j) = -d_5(i, j) = d_7(i, j) = -1 \quad (28a)$$

$$d_{2k-1}(i, j) = -d_{2k}(i, j) \quad (i < j, i, j = 1, 2, 3) \quad (28b)$$

Therefore, we can define the generation matrices of W-class concurrence vector by

$$M_C^W(i, j) = \rho^{1/2} \hat{\rho}^W(i, j) \rho^{1/2} \quad (29)$$

It is easy to obtain that for a pure state $|\psi\rangle$, its W-class concurrence is given by

$$C_{ij}^W = |\langle \Psi_{ij} | \psi \rangle| \quad (30a)$$

$$|\Psi_{ij}\rangle = \sum_{k=1}^8 d_k(i, j) \langle \psi | B_k(i, j) \rangle |B_k(i, j)\rangle \quad (30b)$$

While W-class concurrence vector for the mixed states, again according to Wootters' form without proof, can be suggested as

$$C_{ij}^W = \max \left(2\lambda_1^W(i, j) - \sum_{k=1}^8 \lambda_k^W(i, j), 0 \right) \quad (31)$$

where the $\lambda_k^W(i, j)$ ($i < j$, $i, j = 1, 2, 3$), in decreasing order, are the square roots of the eigenvalues corresponding to the generation matrices $M_C^W(1, 2)$, $M_C^W(1, 3)$ and $M_C^W(2, 3)$. Then a W-class measure vector of entanglement and its norm are just

$$E_{ij}^W = H \left[\frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \sqrt{1 - C_{ij}^{W2}} \right) \right] \quad (32)$$

$$E_T^W = \sqrt{E_{12}^{W2} + E_{13}^{W2} + E_{23}^{W2}} \quad (33)$$

They can be used to describe and qualify W-class entanglement of the entangled states both in total and between arbitrary two partite.

It is easy to get that for a pure state defined by Eq.(21)

$$C_{12}^W = 2|x_3x_5 + x_4x_6 - x_1x_7 - x_2x_8| \quad (34a)$$

$$C_{13}^W = 2|x_2x_5 - x_1x_6 + x_4x_7 - x_3x_8| \quad (34b)$$

$$C_{23}^W = 2|x_2x_3 - x_1x_4 + x_6x_7 - x_5x_8| \quad (34c)$$

For the fully separable pure states, they are zero. For a general W-state and anti W-state, we have

$$C_{12}^W = 2|\beta\gamma|, \quad C_{13}^W = 2|\alpha\gamma|, \quad C_{23}^W = 2|\alpha\beta| \quad (35a)$$

$$C_{12}^{\bar{W}} = 2|\alpha\beta|, \quad C_{13}^{\bar{W}} = 2|\alpha\gamma|, \quad C_{23}^{\bar{W}} = 2|\beta\gamma| \quad (35b)$$

They rightly give out the pair of entanglement of the general W-states and/or the general anti W-states [12]. For the general GHZ's states including the non maximum ones (for example, $\alpha|000\rangle + \beta|111\rangle$), their components of W-class concurrence vector are all equal to 0. Again, note that the fact that GHZ-class concurrence vectors of the general W-states or the general anti W-states are equal to zero, we think that these results imply that our classification to be useful and correct.

It must point out that both C^{ghz} and C^W do not exactly describe the partially separable states in general. As a example, considering the state $(y_1|00\rangle + y_2|01\rangle + y_3|10\rangle + y_4|11\rangle) \otimes (a_3|0\rangle + b_3|1\rangle)$. In terms of our concurrences, its non-zero components of concurrence vectors are

$$C_{12}^{\text{ghz}} = 2|y_1y_4 - y_2y_3|(2|a_3b_3|) \quad (36a)$$

$$C_{12}^W = 2|y_1y_4 - y_2y_3|(|a_3^2 + b_3^2|) \quad (36b)$$

the others components are zero as expected. In order to exactly back to the usual case of two qubits at least for a pure state, we introduce the whole concurrence vector

$$C_{ij} = \frac{C_{ij}^{\text{ghz}} + C_{ij}^W}{\sum_{\alpha} \lambda_{\alpha} (|a_k^2(\alpha) + b_k^2(\alpha)| + 2|a_k(\alpha)b_k(\alpha)|)} \quad (37)$$

where $i \neq j \neq k$, $i < j$, and λ_{α} and $a_k(\alpha)|0\rangle + b_k(\alpha)|1\rangle$ are respectively the eigenvalues and corresponding eigenvectors of the reduced density matrix of k partite. *Actually, in the definitions of C_{ij}^{ghz} and C_{ij}^W , the above denominator in eq.(37) can be added either.* In our above example, it is $|a_3^2 + b_3^2| + 2|a_3b_3|$, and thus $C_{12} = 2|y_1y_4 - y_2y_3|$. It is just the same as Wootters' concurrence [5]. Therefore, we can think that the whole entanglement vector of three qubits can be defined by

$$E_{ij} = H \left[\frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \sqrt{1 - C_{ij}^2} \right) \right] \quad (38)$$

and its norm, as a measure of whole entanglement, is just

$$E = \sqrt{E_{12}^2 + E_{13}^2 + E_{23}^2} \quad (39)$$

For four qubits, we can, in similar way, define

$$\tilde{\rho}^{\text{ghz}}(1, 2) = (\sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_1) \rho^* (\sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_1) \quad (40a)$$

$$\tilde{\rho}^{\text{ghz}}(1, 3) = (\sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_1) \rho^* (\sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_1) \quad (40b)$$

$$\tilde{\rho}^{\text{ghz}}(1, 4) = (\sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_2) \rho^* (\sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_2) \quad (40c)$$

$$\tilde{\rho}^{\text{ghz}}(2, 3) = (\sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_1) \rho^* (\sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_1) \quad (40d)$$

$$\tilde{\rho}^{\text{ghz}}(2, 4) = (\sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_2) \rho^* (\sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_2) \quad (40e)$$

$$\tilde{\rho}^W(1, 2) = (\sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_0 \otimes \sigma_0) \rho^* (\sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_0 \otimes \sigma_0) \quad (41a)$$

$$\tilde{\rho}^W(1, 3) = (\sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_0 \otimes \sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_0) \rho^* (\sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_0 \otimes \sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_0) \quad (41b)$$

$$\tilde{\rho}^W(1, 4) = (\sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_0 \otimes \sigma_0 \otimes \sigma_2) \rho^* (\sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_0 \otimes \sigma_0 \otimes \sigma_2) \quad (41c)$$

$$\tilde{\rho}^W(2, 3) = (\sigma_0 \otimes \sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_0) \rho^* (\sigma_0 \otimes \sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_0) \quad (41d)$$

$$\tilde{\rho}^W(2, 4) = (\sigma_0 \otimes \sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_0 \otimes \sigma_2) \rho^* (\sigma_0 \otimes \sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_0 \otimes \sigma_2) \quad (41e)$$

Further, in terms of the above methods and procedure, we can define the two-classes of concurrence vectors and then the two classes of entanglement vectors which respectively quantify GHZ-class and W-class entanglement of the entangled states. Obviously, we can extend, in principle, our method to any N -partite system consisting of N qubits.

In the end, we would like to point out that our physical idea is reasonable and our conclusions are clear at least for the pure states. The whole entanglement also can be thought of eq.(39) when the classification is not important. In the case of mixed states, a strict proof about the definitions of two classes of concurrence vectors is expected. It seems to be very difficult since so far ones have no enough knowledge about the entanglement in the multipartite systems. Alternatively, the numerical simulations should be able to be used for revealing and analysis the behaviors of $E^{\text{ghz}}(i, j)$ and $E^W(i, j)$. Nevertheless, we will try, in theoretical, to prove strictly that our GHZ-class and W-class entanglement measure norms are invariant or non-increasing under LOCC.

This study is on progressing.

-
- [1] C.H.Bennett, G.Brassard, C.Crépeau, R.Jozsa, A.Peres, and W.K.Wootters, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 1895(1993)
 - [2] C.H.Bennett, H.J.Bernstein, S.Popesu, and B.Schumacher, *Phys. Rev. A* **53**, 2046(1996); S.Popesu, D.Rohrlich, *Phys. Rev. A* **56**, R3319(1997)
 - [3] V.Vedral, M.B.Plenio, K.Jacobs, and P.L.Knight, *Phys. Rev. A* **56**, 4452(1997); V.Vedral, M.B.Plenio, M.A.Rippin, and P.L.Knight, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 2275(1997); V.Vedral and M.B.Plenio, *Phys. Rev. A* **57**, 1619(1998)
 - [4] Eric M. Rains, quant-ph/9809082
 - [5] W.K.Wootters, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 2245(1998); S.Hill and W.K.Wootters, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 5022(1997)
 - [6] C. H. Bennett, S. Popescu, D. Rohrlich, J. A. Smolin and A. V. Thapliyal, *Phys. Rev. A* **63**, (2001) 012307
 - [7] C. Emary and C. W. J. Beenakker, *Phys. Rev. A* **69**, 032317 (2004)
 - [8] An Min Wang, quant-ph/0011040
 - [9] An Min Wang, quant-ph/0203093 (also see quant-ph/0001023), quant-ph/0012029
 - [10] An Min Wang, *Chinese Phys. Lett.* **20** 1907(2003)
 - [11] An Min Wang, *Commun. Theor. Phys.* **36** p4792(2004)
 - [12] W. Dür, G. Vidal, J. I. Cirac *Phys. Rev. A* **62**, 062314 (2000)